

rule, however, increasing the fees has one result—it checks the supply of candidates, and this, the members tell us, is the very result they wish to achieve. But have they reckoned the ultimate cost of their action? Have they yet experienced the full force of their restrictions? We think not. It is an oft-repeated truism that no human institution can continue without additions to its membership from time to time; in a very few years the best would come to an end, unless it were replenished by young men, who, in their turn, have to be supplanted by others, as death or other circumstances remove them. Of course in a numerous lodge or other society, this gradual falling off is not felt for some time, but eventually the contingency must be faced, just as surely as must the hand of death; and when a lodge becomes so reduced in numbers—the result of restrictive legislation—as to call for special action, the brethren will find they have a much greater labor to surmount in securing a return of former success than had their fellows when they desired to check it. Indeed, it is seldom a lodge recovers itself when, under such circumstances, it may be said to have run itself down.

There are many considerations which necessitate a limit being put on the membership of a lodge, among the most prominent of which are the comfort of the members and the accommodation the lodge possesses for its meetings. A large lodge is frequently a difficult one to manage, and there are many who affirm it is impossible to get any true enjoyment out of assemblies which are attended by so many brethren that it is impossible to know even the names of half those present. However this may be, we will not now attempt to decide; we have enjoyed ourselves at small quiet meetings, and we have enjoyed ourselves as one of a large company where quietness was anything but the predominant feature. We have also

spent some of the most unsatisfactory of our hours of "pleasure" in small, quiet assemblies, such as would have delighted the hearts of those who abhor all large meetings. Considerations of accommodation are of much greater importance than that of mere numbers, and this is one which really demands attention. A lodge-room and other quarters which will provide comfort for thirty brethren will make forty as uncomfortable as can well be conceived, and so it becomes necessary, sometimes, to put a limit on the number of members who shall be allowed to join a lodge, and this can well be done by fixing a limit beyond which nominations shall not go, rather than by raising the dues already referred to. A rule is adopted in many of our lodges, more especially those in the Provinces, limiting the membership, and this rule works well. If the numbers fall off at any time, there is no alteration to be made ere new members can be attracted, as is the case where the only course appears to be to reduce the fees, in order to counteract the mischief done in the past; it also has the effect of placing all members on the same footing. All enter the lodge at the same fee, and all have the same privileges, but where some have paid the original fee, and others the increased one, feelings of inequality are forever associated.

In conclusion, we would urge on those who find their lodges too cumbersome, to banish all thoughts of increasing the fees, and to adopt, as a temporary check, a rule which limits the number of the members; this they can amend at any time, while it is all but impossible to reduce the fees, as by so doing a lodge so acting will be looked upon as declining in prosperity, and in most instances will be found to have signed its own death warrant.—*London (Eng.) Freemasons' Chronicle.*

The Grand Lodge of Mississippi has just donated \$500 to the Natchez Orphan Asylum.